Dr. Philip Mossman March 2, 1992

[redacted]

Dear Phil:

You asked for my permission to create a new appendix in your book using Bordley. Of course you may use it anyway you wish.

Your February 26, 1992 letter was very exciting and your findings explain many things. Do the newspaper inclusions use Bordley's name or the initial B or what as author ? You state that the sheep raising comment had a B.

The differences between the newspaper publication and the final pamphlet form are fascinating.

To complicate your life I located a photocopy of a part of Bordley which I had in my files and which has further interlineations for the next Bordley publication. I have no idea where the original is. ANS has no record of it in their library. A copy is enclosed of what I have.

Naturally I will look forward to any newspaper or other data on the Bordley Supplement which now could be 1789 or 1790.

I have now found one more item for your book. It resulted from early numismatic bibliographical research brought about by the Bordley item. I am glad I found it in time. It is in the enclosed item published in 1838 and written by a Philadelphian. He confirmed the 48 coppers to the shilling by stating that the Connecticut coinage was the farthing of his youth. I called the Library Company of Philadelphia to get his birth and death dates (1771-1846). It also indicates that the New York and Pennsylvania copper rates could be the same as Mease was living in Philadelphia in his youth. It also shows the rate held firm for a reasonable period, if youth extends over a few years. It is curious that you show the 48 rate with a New York dateline in a Philadelphia newspaper in your letter to me.

When it rains it pours.

Sincerely,

Eric P. Newman

encls:

Dr. Philip Mossman [redacted] March 23, 1992

Dear Phil:

I am very appreciative of your continued expansion of the findings as to the development of the John Beale Bordley writings. It has been carefully placed with the Bordley pamphlet and supplement which I treasure.

As to the Mease item you seem to be concerned about not having located it in your research because it was not indexed. That is not unusual as I missed a major item on my 1804 dollar research because it was indexed under 1904 dollar.

My location of the Mease article was quite simple -- serendipity!

I realized that the description of the Bordley (Lot 378) by the cataloguer (Kolbe) was amazingly detailed and wondered where it came from. It mentioned Mayer's The Literature of American Numismatics which I was not familar with until I remembered that Lot # 450 offered in the same catalog mentioned Bordley too.

I reread the description of #450 and wondered why I had not bid on it. There I saw a reference to Mease (two) and to Fisher (one). I walked over to the Mercantile Library (one block away from my office) and read the three articles and there was the "old farthing of our boyhood". I immediately wondered whether you knew of it and contacted you because of its importance.

I think I will put the Mease article in The Numismatist as it seems to be the earliest numismatic article on coins used in America after independence. Do you agree? There are earlier English publications with Massachusetts silver, etc. but without any American copper pieces. There are U.S. Mint reports and opinions on coinage by Morris, Jefferson, etc. but nothing from a numismatic point of view on coins. I, like you, am not as stimulated by medals. How would you describe the Mease coin article?

To end this letter on the upkick I just asked Kolbe who bought the Mayer's item in the December 1991 sale. He told me that he did. I asked if it was for sale and you can guess who owns it now. I'll send you a copy when it arrives. It was published in Norton's Literary letter and is illustrated with four American Colonial coins.

Serendipitously yours,

Eric P. Newman

Dr. Philip Mossman

[redacted]

June 18, 1992

Dear Phil:

By my customary serendipity I came across an August 22, 1785 mint proposal signed B. That pricked up my ears. It has comments on copper and a copy is enclosed. Because of my interest in Bordley I devoured it. I did not even check to see if it is known. It states that it was then only known through handbills and that was about April 1788 when it was printed in Columbian Magazine Vol.II No. 4.

Please let me know if this is already known or is a new find. Its content has some similar material to the 1789 publication.

My best,

Eric P. Newman

P.S. B also submitted a part of Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations which is enclosed.

Dr. Philip Mossman February 7, 1994

[redacted]

Dear Phil:

I hit a jackpot by triple serendipity.

I was looking through a book on American Typefounders and saw a mention of a paper money exchange table as an example of 1763 printing. I wrote you. I tried to get a copy of the money table from the only source mentioned in Evans (Brown University) which could not find it. They sent me instead a 1764 table which they found. In the 1764 table was a separate halfpenny calculating table.

That is triple serendipity for copper research (1) typefounding produces evidence of 1763 paper broadside (2) broadside cannot be located by library and library sends "unknown" 1764 paper money table instead (3) 1764 broadside includes a detailed halfpence table which 1763 table does not have. Is the halfpence table important enough to publish in EAC or Colonial Newsletter?

Sincerely,

Eric P. Newman

P.S. I have now learned that the 1763 broadside in Evans is listed in error as it has the wrong city and wrong printer. I have a copy of it now.

Dr. Philip Mossman February 28, 1994

[redacted]

Dear Phil:

Your February 15, 1994 letter is much appreciated. The proposed coinage of copper for New York is new to me. Thanks for sharing it.

My Rhode Island find is not as exciting to me as I first thought. I checked the January 1, 1749/50 broadside of Rogers & Fowle in Boston and found the same data generally - also another in the Boston pocket pamphlet of the same period (photocopies enclosed). Neither is a separate table for copper, merely added to other coins. What they do prove is that farthings were not enough in circulation to merit mention more than incidentally (in two places). It is also interesting that when sterling is 4s 7½d to the dollar the copper halfpence do not seem to be recalculated for a payment.

I submitted the Rhode Island item to Jim and if he is interested I will write a little blurb to explain it. I'll point out the lack of farthings and the separate table exclusively for coppers.

Bring on the Bordley. We are going to Costa Rica shortly to see butterflies, birds and people.

Thanks again,

Eric P. Newman

enclosures

Dr. Philip Mossman January 18, 1995

[redacted]

Dear Phil:

Enclosed is what I believe is a new find but I can not read it all. I learned about it in the Index to the Papers of the Continental Congress when I visited Washington in October 1994. It has no date and no author. It is in the 1785-1789 period files but that is not conclusive. I just received the copy from my friends there.

Will you be nice enough to type a copy for me and return the original positive I enclose. I am sending you a photocopy for your file. Your comments will be appreciated. Maybe we ought to write it up together if it turns out to be worthwhile.

Never a dull moment.

Sincerely,

Eric P. Newman

Philip Mossman [redacted]

February 6, 1995

Dear Phil:

As to the Vermont Nova style designs you mention in point 4 I do not understand why you say that prior to 1785 the New York engravers of the Vermonts were familiar with the Nova design.

I think that the Vermonts, being first authorized by law on June 15, 1785 were not struck until after October 15, 1785 when the weight was reduced by law. The die makers probably would have seen the Novas during the period, rather than prior to 1785. The fact that Vermont varieties have both blunt and pointed rays just as the 1783 dated Novas did (the 1785 blunt rays was a 1783 left over) makes it a reasonable certainty that the Vermont die makers saw the Nova coinage themselves, not any drawing. The drawing would not have had blunt rays because the silver Novas didn't. Thus if several varieties of the Novas first came to America about the middle of 1785 the Vermont die makers (who were in New York) had adequate time to copy them.

Thus I feel that the Vermont situation does not contradict the 1785 introduction of the 1783 dated Novas into America.

Your speculative point 5 as to the extra star on the 1783 Novas is cute but so subtle if true that no one would know it. A quatrefoil word separator is used on one die, a 5 pointed star on another and also period. The stars between the rays are 6 pointed. Vermont wanting equal status would not want to be a pointless member of the union (I'll bet that pun is new).

Maybe I should take on Novas at the coming COAC as I have a surprise fact.

Yours,

Eric P. Newman

Philip Mossman [redacted] February 6, 1995

Dear Phil:

Thank you so much for the transcription of the 1785-1789 document.

I applied my eyes and imagination to the missing words and I believe they are as follows:

Page 1, 1st in need

Page 1, 2nd circulation

Page 2, 3rd (line 1) change Congress to Coinage
(line 10) when

Page 2 (line 2) Further

Page 2 (line 24) I believe this is intended to be capable but is misspelled (change footnote)

This appears to me possibly to be a proposal about the time of the Fugio proposal. Duer had an inside track politically so this proposer had no chance. Perhaps we should look up the other proposals of the late 1786 and early 1787 period to see if this could fit in.

What think thee? Send me any revision you make please.

Thanks again,

Eric P. Newman

Philip Mossman February 6, 1995

[redacted]

Dear Phil:

I would like to comment on line 2 and 3 and point 17 of your letter of January 22, 1995 concerning quantity of Novas.

I agree that the existence of three pairs of dies for 1783 and others for 1785 makes the one die statement inaccurate. What was meant probably is one style of die as no one then cared about die differences if they looked alike.

Newton is early 18th century. By the 1780s the process of coining had drastically improved. The screw press needed only a one quarter turn for striking. A most important advance was the automatic feeder about which I gave a lecture to EAC. There was a rocker rod on the screw press which on each turn of the screw press pushed a sliding tongs back and forth. The tongs would open and a planchet would drop in. It would be pushed to the die for striking and the struck coin swept off on the next push of the rod which also brought a new planchet.

This must have increased production to 10 or more per minute if several men alternated to swing the bar.

I do not think men worked more than 10 hours per day but I would imagine that there could have been night shifts.

I am convinced that the long swings of the screw press and the hand placement of planchets of Newton's time were long gone in the Birmingham area due to Boulton. Thus the production could have easily been done over a reasonable period.

My best,

Eric P. Newman

Philip Mossman [redacted]

February 6, 1995

Dear Phil:

This is a partial answer to the part of page 3 of your letter dated January 22, 1995 as to your money of account discovery.

I find that the use of colonial moneys of account lasted to some extent until small Spanish money was withdrawn from American circulation in 1857.

The one real or one bit was known as the York shilling in New York and elsewhere (8 shillings to the dollar) as you may know. Pine Tree shillings in the coin charts and manuals were quoted in the 1850's at 16 cents (1 shilling lawful money). The straightening out of Revolutionary War arguments over finance matters was still going on 50 years after independence. Old deeds and long term contracts were still in money of account language and one had to be familiar with them. State coppers were still in circulation at a specific number to the shilling rather than so many to the cent. Many people were still very much alive who had used moneys of account before 1815.

It is no wonder that one had to know how to calculate values in money of account. That was a good school exercise as well. In addition those that revise books usually do not take out material.

My best,

Eric P. Newman

Philip Mossman [redacted]

February 8, 1995

Dear Phil:

I submit a suggestion for removal of your use of CONSTELLATIO NOVA in your book and replacing it with NOVA CONSTELLATIO. I may be wrong in my opinion but I think the reversal springs from attempted erudition by Breen and followed by a few others.

The 100 and 500 unit 1783 silver patterns and 5 unit copper pattern are definitely NOVA CONSTELLATIO in that order with a very large space before the beginning and after the end of the expression. There is ornamentation or insignia in that space except on the 100 mills and there is no ornamentation or extra space between NOVA and CONSTELLATIO in any of those three denominations.

The 1000 unit silver pattern is not quite as obvious because the open space between words is about equal. However, an ornament is in the space after CONSTELLATIO and before NOVA and there is nothing in the space between NOVA and CONSTELLATIO. The ornament is clearly a stop just as the ornaments are stops on the 5 unit and 500 unit pieces. On the LIBERTAS JUSTITA side of the patterns there are stops between each word because the words express separate thoughts.

The 1783 and 1785 normal copper coinage has no enlarged spaces indicating any order of words and whenever there are ornaments or stops they are placed uniformly between the words so that order cannot be determined from them.

Crosby and all the early writers and catalogers use only NOVA CONSTELLATIO. What right does anyone have to change what is obviously clear in the patterns and subsequent writing just to show what proper Latin should have been. It is stilted as I see it to reverse the established order to be correct grammatically and incorrect numismatically.

AVON OITALLETSNOC is the mirror image and might be used for Avon Products but that is as much reversal as I can recommend.

I hope restoring the original order seems like a sound NOVA idea.

Eric P. Newman

Philip Mossman [redacted]

February 27, 1995

Dear Phil:

To add to my February 8, 1995 letter to you about CONSTELLATIO NOVA I find that I inadvertently was the one who started the word reversal. I had again quoted the English newspapers of 1786 (which put it in reversed) in CNL, Oct. 1973, p. 422. Breen seized upon the disclosure (CNL, Sept. 1974, p. 453-5), used an eye brow, a counterfeit and a poetic license and swallowed it all the way to his encyclopedia. Even Curwen's diary of 1784 uses Nova Constellatio.

So (Mia Culpa, Mia Culpa) I have the duty to straighten it out. If you agree you may wish to change your diagram of coinage interlock as well as the text and index of your wonderful book. Incidentally Hodder saw a copy of the February 8, 1995 letter I sent you and has just written me that he has determined that NOVA CONSTELLATIO is correct, but makes no reference to his extended usage of the reverse order. He bases his opinion on the use of NOVA CONSTELLATIO by Robert Morris.

I am glad you don't live in EBORAC NOVA or I might use 44440 as your zip code.

What do you now think?

Sincerely,

Eric P. Newman

Philip L. Mossman [redacted] January 22, 1996

Dear Phil:

Thank you for your comments and corrections on the Nova Constellatio piece. All have been included except putting the final quotation mark after the period or comma which is not part of the quote. I think this affects the accuracy of the quote and I hope you will forgive me for not using it even if it may be technically proper.

Your comments on the Vermont-Immune poor quality and on the planchet weight deviation on 1783 and 1785 Novas are appreciated, but they belong in your opus.

I am glad you are trying to straighten out enthusiast Lorenzo. He really needed it.

I just completed going over Fuld's manuscript on Washingtoniana and had to make quantities of changes and corrections in its 126 pages. He may never speak to me again but I had to try to bring its quality up to a better level. He often cannot locate the support for some of his statements. He assumes everyone will believe whatever he believes. He thinks faster than he writes and doesn't review his own writing as you and I do.

We had a marvelous trip to the Arabian Gulf.

Thrive on your 2/7th retirement.

Sincerely,

Eric P. Newman

Dr. Philip Mossman

September 24, 1996
Re: Immune Columbia

Dear Phil:

Your September 15, 1996 letter on the above topic needs a prompt response and so here goes.

Crosby was unaware that the IMMUNE COLUMBIA die was combined in copper with the three known NOVA CONSTELLATIO dies, not just two.

As to how I discovered the pair of new dies is easily explained. There was no illustration of the Edwards Immune forgery in Kenney and the Edwards illustration in Crosby grades "about terrible" on one side and "full terrible" on the other. I felt I had to point out differences between the Edward's forgery and the genuine pieces. I found that Kenneth Bressett had taken a picture of the Massachusetts Historical Society example of the Edwards forgery 40 years ago and it was in my photo file. I asked him recently for a clearer print which he sent. I studied the genuine and the Edwards forgery in order to explain the main differences, using my coins and the photos I gathered for my article whether struck in copper or silver. I also had to study the copper piece which Stack's withdrew from their auction years ago. I also have photos of the silver and gold mates to the piece withdrawn from Stack's auction. I was studying the scale area of the genuine pieces carefully because of the withdrawn piece and I noticed that the top of the scale pans of genuine pieces and the Edwards forgery were on a different level when compared to the adjacent lettering. I felt my eyes were deceiving me and then looked at all my photos. Thus I saw that there were two different but similar genuine IMMUNE dies, not one. Then I naturally went to the NOVA side to see what I could see. I then found that difference. To be sure that there was no recutting of one die into another state I naturally checked this possibility.

Dr. Jackson had the opportunity to read my article in advance and made no comment. A couple of years ago I had encouraged him to update the matter he wrote in 1992 but he did not show any interest. I told him I had a large file on the Immune pieces and felt that there was lots of monkey business and I always have felt that Stickney knew the gold IMMUNE he exchanged with the Mint for an 1804 dollar was a restrike as no self respecting coiner trying to sell anyone copper coinage would strike a gold sample on a guinea and leave the undercoin design showing.

Cogan obviously knew Dr. Edwards and Cogan's comments in his catalog are reliable in my opinion. Of Dr. Edwards piece(s) a maximum of two are known and there may only be one. The second piece is known as the Kaplan forgery on my photo.

I wish you the best on your editorship and your research enjoyment. I will try to help anytime you wish. I probably have some cast state coppers but do not know if they are genuine. Ringo knows what I have and can answer.

Thank you for commenting on my "party". My wife thought up the substitution of my mug for Franklin's. Everyone was afraid I might be miffed but I was delighted to see comedy enter the field. I think Franklin might be amused as well as I am one of his many devotees.

My best to you, Eric P. Newman

Philip L. Mossman [redacted] December 9, 1996

Dear Phil:

I am glad I helped a little. You really dig up weird footnotes.

Piastre is I believe of Italian origin referring to a Levant coin of dollar size.

As to the French word gourde I believe the calabash or other melon referred to are fat on one end and if the spanish referred to the melons as gordas then it is logical to have that apply to French usage. A fat piastre is a heavy one.

As to shin plaster coming from chien piastre that is too far fetched. A dog dollar was a silver Dutch trade coin and was referred to as such in English because a rampant lion looked like a dog. Shin plasters were less than one dollar. Black dogs were Dutch doits made of billon etc. and the expression was used in the West Indies for small coins and not on the continent.

I think you should mention but disagree with both footnotes as speculations.

Sincerely,

Eric P. Newman

Philip Mossman
Colonial Newsletter
[redacted]

January 29, 1997

Dear Phil:

Frank Campbell has been ill and has been away from his desk for some days. I hope he gets better soon.

Both Ken Bressett and I have never found or heard of another find of coins containing any Wood's Hibernia pieces in America except a coin or so in the Philadelphia Highway find which any British sailor could have had in his pocket. Perhaps one might have been found in Williamsburg (see my monograph if I mention it). I have never heard of a St. Patrick "farthing" found in America either. Breen had no facts and was stubborn when I first raised the subject. He never would change his mind on anything we disagreed on because he was under pressure not to agree with me whenever possible.

Michael Dolley was a brilliant unwashed disturbed Irish Catholic but fortunately a good numismatic friend of mine.

Sincerely,

Eric P. Newman

Dr. Philip Mossman April 21, 1997

[redacted]

Dear Phil:

Your recent interest in further details on the Stepney, Fairfield County, Connecticut hoard of copper coins found in an iron pot in 1950 has encouraged me to investigate further my involvement with it. I have continued to search my files and have examined the coins I purchased from it with the hope of clarifying what took place almost a half century ago.

The most exciting experience of my numismatic life was the acquisition and identification of the 1776 Counterfeit British Halfpence (now known as Vlack 9-76B) minted at Machin's Mills near Newberg, New York in the 1787 period and described in an article I wrote in 1958 for the American Numismatic Society's Centennial Publication entitled " A Recently Discovered Coin Solves a Vermont Numismatic Enigma".

The Stepney hoard matter arose during my early correspondence with Walter Breen. I have fortunately found his letters written to me when he was a student at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore. He had examined the Stepney hoard at Stack's office and had published the details in The Numismatist for January 1952. I recently sent you a copy of his Feb. 7, 1952 letter to me further describing the hoard. I was anxious to remember which counterfeit British halfpence I acquired from the hoard and how, why and when that had occurred.

The situation was substantially clarified by a routine error which Breen made in dating a letter to me. I enclose a copy of that letter dated 22 Jan 1951 which was filed by me under that date. It refers to his study of the hoard in May-June 1951 and thus the date of the letter has to be Jan 22, 1952. All of us have a problem in adjusting our minds to designate the new year properly when writing just after the change.

The letter states that "the imitation halfpence are still kicking around in a drawer in Stacks office". To determine when I obtained some of them I went to my bank statements for 1952 and I found my check for $7.50 payable to Stack's dated February 22,

1952 (copy enclosed). Do you feel that I overpaid as their prices ranged from 50¢ to $2.50 each ? The envelopes I prepared to put them in specifically have Stepney (or Fairfield) hoard typed on for the following pieces:

Date	Vlack #	Breen list #	Weight in grains	Condition	Remarks
1772	6-72A29		114.75	No wear Glossy red brown	
1776	9-76B55		116.5	No wear Glossy brown	CEORCIVS
1778	11-78A	63	110.5	No wear Glossy red brown	
1787	17-87A	65 or 66	118.75	No wear Glossy red brown	
1787	19-87C	69	119.25	No wear Glossy red brown	
1788	23-88A	70 or 71	97.0	No wear Glossy red brown	

Some weights of the coins vary from Breen's list and I have rechecked the weights on my scale. When I say "no wear" I mean no sign of circulation. A couple of the pieces have devices which are not sharply struck up. This could be weak die detail, possibly to make them look a little worn even when they were new. The fields are perfectly level and immaculate. The color is uniform throughout each piece.

I may own one or two more from the hoard but am not sure because they are not so marked on my envelopes.

I finally found my letters to Breen on the subject and enclose copies dated January 17, 1952, January 24, 1952, and March 13, 1952. My secretary made a few errors which I did not catch such as referring to my letter of January 22, 1952 when it was January 17, 1952 and using the corrected date of his letter as the date of my letter.

You will note that I knew he wanted to become a doctor so I erroneously "doctored up" his address in my March 13, 1952 letter to him by using the hospital's name instead of the University name.

The difficulty in my finding these old letters is that some are filed by subject matter (often there were several subjects) and some by correspondent's name. We didn't have handy copy machines then.

I naturally wrote Stack's after receiving the information in Breen's February 9, 1952 letter and asked Stack's to send me the George III counterfeits. What luck ! This was a top drawer incident.

If there are comments you may have please feel free to make them. If you believe any part of this stuff is interesting enough for CNL inclusion I will gladly help.

My best to you.

Sincerely,

Eric P. Newman

P.S. In the 1997 book by Bowers entitled American Coin Treasures and Hoards (p. 36-37) he changed the place name of the hoard to "Stepney Depot" which I think is different from Stepney and thus an error. He quoted my earlier comments but due to my new findings should be corrected.

Dr. Phillip Mossman
Colonial Newsletter
[redacted]

May 28, 1997

Dear Phil:

I just read the C4 Newsletter for Spring 1997 and noticed that there is no mention of CNL or ANS. With all the opinions expressed in the C4 Winter 1996 issue I thought there might be an encouragement to join ANS or comment about the CNL issue. I notice an extensive article on the 1787 Immune in C4. Perhaps CNL should encourage participation in C4 and reading its newsletter just to be friendly or comment on such a scholarly inclusion. I hope there is no significant feeling of competitiveness by C4.

I also notice that Dan Friedus has resigned from editorship, Why?

My best,

Eric P. Newman

Philip L. Mossman [redacted] August 25, 1997

Dear Phil:

Since the Stepney hoard was found in modern times I am still mystified as to why its source is unknown or concealed.

You might write Harvey Stack directly to ask him rather than go through Hodder.

We just returned from Botswanna and the animals were spectacular. Why don't you go there?

Your wild friend,

Eric P. Newman

Philip L. Mossman [redacted] August 25, 1997

Dear Phil:

As to the newly identified pair of Immune Columbia dies and the known ones I think you might stress how important it is to have data gathered because it may help untangle why the dies came to America and how they were used. It may add information to New Jersey, Vermont, Machins' or other area coinage. It may help Federal design understanding. It even relates to the 1804 dollar. It is one in which there are a reasonable number of existing pieces. It will enable weight, edge study, and planchet study to be coordinated with ease. You could ask readers to inform us where the coins are and to offer participation in the study.

Sincerely,

Eric P. Newman

To: Phil Mossman

From: Eric P. Newman

Date: March 27, 1998

The Hannah's Town coin discoveries were known to the Fort Severance, PA people when I visited there long ago. Perhaps they have Woodside's notations. Perhaps the Carnegie Library in Pittsburgh has them along with his numismatic library.

The cut piece of a Mass shilling which I saw when I was there was mentioned by me in the introduction to the reprint of Noe.

Philip Mossman

[redacted]

April 22, 1998

Dear Phil:

Your powerful and stimulating lecture was appreciated by all of us. It indicated that you digested and refined endless quantities of data. Congratulations.

Evelyn and I and our daughter enjoyed being with you and Mary for the festivities and we hope there will be more such occasions.

Thank you for having the slides made for me. Before you publish I will try to straighten out which coins are Stepney and which are not. Breen says No. 56 (the CEORGIVS) weighs 118 and it weighs 116.5 grains. He may have mixed up the weight with No. 55. I wish I had been more respectful of source.

My best,

Eric P. Newman

Dr. Philip L. Mossman

[redacted]

August 31, 1998

Dear Phil:

I have been vigorously telephoning you to congratulate you on the NLG award for CNL. Since you are wandering I want to write that you deserved that and more.

May CNL continue under your guidance with the quality standard already set.

Thrive,

Eric P. Newman

Dr. Philip L. Mossman August 31, 1998

[redacted]

Dear Phil:

In your August 23, 1998 letter you mention the counterfeit Massachusetts copper theory and you state there is current thought that the dates (I assume they mean date punches) are the same as on Machins 87-c reverses.

This sounds goofy to me. How could they make a counterfeit without the device punches? Does someone think the Massachusetts group handed over the dies or loaned the device punches and the letter and date punches to the Machins boys for a while?

If my logic is not sound please advise me.

Sincerely,

Eric P. Newman

Philip L. Mossman [redacted] January 11, 2000

Dear Phil:

Your December 5, 1999 reply to my spelling inquiry has remained unanswered due to my recovery from our wonderful trip to Viet Nam and Laos. We had 14 inches of rain in 4 days, resulting in 100% humidity plus mist which penetrated our otherwise dry clothing and floods such that we were walking in knee high water in the streets in order to see some towns. I caught cold, Asian flu and added jet lag on returning. For three weeks I would sleep all night, get up and after two hours fall asleep again. My wife joined the experience as well.

Your comments are extraordinarily helpful. I have examined other contemporary writings due to your Bradford comments. I now find that there are so many transcription errors from manuscript to typeset that spelling errors in typeset form cannot be relied upon. I am rewriting the entire article and will include much more material. You are right that if the date was not changed why should they bother about spelling. The important fact I have learned is that spelling was inconsequential and unimportant at that time if phonetics were correct. I assume you know that short hand was sometimes used by Hull in his diary. Where can I get a copy of Clarke on Hull? Pollock published it privately in 1993 before he left Bowers and has not been heard from by them.

It has occured to me that where a single letter is commented upon or an odd spelling is used that these could be in bold type whether lower case or caps. This might avoid /t/ or /ss/ or italics or quotation marks. Your comment made me reconsider this as I used quotation marks sometimes but was unfamiliar with the /s/ emphasis.

I will try to send you my revision when I get it in shape.

I am celebrating new year as I talked to to the millipede at our butterfly house as to what to do and he threw up 100 legs in disgust. The ANS mess is too difficult for me to comment on. It is a tragedy.

I hope you are thriving and the new year will continue to see our contact full of excitement.

Our best,

Eric P. Newman

To: Phil Mossman February 29, 2000

From: Eric P. Newman

Your style of researcb and meticulous accuracy is typical of a Crosby so I think a dilution of genes bypothesis is not accurate. You luckily got some of the same genes Sylvester did. Can you identify whicb ones are controlling numismatic researcb and I'll take a transgenic treatment before I am slabbed.

To: Phil Mossman February 29, 2000

From: Eric P. Newman

Re: Mass. Spelling

Thank you for the helpfulness on the Massachusetts silver coinage prohlem. The Clarke write up was necessary to check out but it has nothing new and is a rehash in my opinion.

As to the Hutchinson Papers quotation I am pleased that Louis Jordan (I did not know of his C.N.L. position) found the spelling Mattachusets in the 1865 typeset puhlication. This further confirms the misreading hy the typesetter of the douhle long s as tt which I have often found elsewhere. The single t in the last syllahle is commonly used in place of tt during the 18th century. Please thank him for me.

To: Phil Mossman February 29, 2000

From: Eric P. Newman

Re: Nova article

The Constellatio Nova paper you sent me is a puzzlement. You did not say whether I should comment or not. Is it intended for CNL? Are you teasing me to get a reaction?

I started this Latin matter in Numismatic Scraphook Magazine (1972) p. 598 et seq. and CNL 38 (1973) p. 422 hy quoting an English comment. Breen went into a frenzy over it and still it continues.

Jordan indicates I am inconsistent in the ornament thinking. His comment about the reverse of the copper Nova does not seem to consider that no adjectival matter is involved and that the space hetween the two words is very large and the space on each side of the date is quite small. The large ornament went in the large space and the small stops went into the small spaces. This is an entirely different decorating prohlem from the other side where the spaces are equal.

The silver coinage word position is clear so why all the Latin toe dancing as to the coppers which copied the silver pieces as Jordan mentions.

To: Philip Mossman
[redacted]

From: Eric P. Newman

May 8, 2000

The draft of my article on New York City bread assizes which I sent you needs two further footnotes which I did not include because I was not sure how detailed they should be or where to put them.

They are:

For a general overview of the history of "coppers" in England and America see: Philip N. Mossman, Money of the American Colonies and Confederation, (New York 1993), Chapter 5, etc.

For previous and subsequent use of "coppers" in payment of assize regulation of bread and flour prices, see Mossman, p. 230, footnote 75.

I look forward to your corrections and suggestions as to the article in general.

Thrive.